REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are pending, with claims 1, 28, 42, and 44 being independent.

Applicants have amended the application to include an abstract on a separate sheet. The abstract was filed with the application and published as part of the PCT application.

Claims 1-35 and 37-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bodnar (6,544,295). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

This response first addresses the rejection with respect to claims 1-27, then claims 28-35 and 37-41, and finally claims 42-46.

Claims 1-27

Claim 1 recites a method of managing navigation information in a computer application that includes, inter alia, establishing a global context that can communicate with a plurality of resources, where each resource resides in an associated local context. State information is communicated from one or more of the local contexts to the global context and global navigation information is maintained based on the communicated state information. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Bodnar fails to describe or suggest managing navigation information in a computer application where state information is communicated from multiple local contexts to a global context such that global navigation information is maintained based on the communicated state information.

Claim 1 enables a user to maintain navigation information in one global context that receives communications from multiple resources, which reside in a local context. For example, one global context maintains navigation information for multiple resources such as, a browser application (e.g., a browser) and a non-browser application (e.g., a word processor). Residing in a local context, the browser application and the non-browser application communicate state information such as, for example, an Internet URL or a non-Internet address to the global context. Because the local context communicates state information to the global context, the global context can maintain global navigation information for the multiple resources that reside in the local context. Thus, unlike prior conventional systems that maintain only local navigation

information for a single local resource, the global context maintains a global navigation for the multiple resources that reside in the local context.

Bodnar does not describe or suggest maintaining a global navigation of multiple resources in a local context based on communications from the multiple local context resources to a global context. In Bodnar, state information is not communicated from the local context to the global context. Instead, Bodnar enables users to manage preferred Internet sites in a computer system having a browser by providing user-created "Quick" marks. The Quick marks let the user organize programs, web sites, and other items in tabs, and start them with a single click. When the user clicks on a Quick marks button, the system launches the user's web browser and connects the user to that web site. After the browser is launched, the user continues to click different Quick marks buttons to connect quickly to desired sites. Bodnar, col. 3, line 59 to col. 4, line 2. Thus, Bodnar provides the user with an interface to launch their favorite web sites. Most importantly, it is the user that sets up the Quick Marks buttons, and thus, there is no communication sent from the programs and web sites that are launched by the Quick marks buttons to the actual Quick marks interface.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-27.

Claims 28-35 and 37-41

Claim 28 recites a method of managing a history list in a computer application that includes, inter alia, receiving state information from a plurality of independent resources, where each resource resides in an associated local context. Based on the received state information, a history of resources accessed by users of the computer application is maintained and a global-context history list representative of an order in which the resources were accessed is presented. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Bodnar fails to describe or suggest managing a history list in a computer application where state information is received from a plurality of independent resources, maintaining a history of

resources accessed by the user, and presenting a global-context history list representative of an order in which the resources were accessed.

As described above with respect to claim 1, Bodnar fails to describe or suggest communicating state information from resources residing in a local context to a global context. Furthermore, Bodnar does not describe or suggest maintaining a history of resources accessed by user of the computer application. Also, Bodnar fails to describe or suggest presenting a global-context history list representative of an order in which the resources were accessed.

Notably, the Office Action relies upon Fig. 7 of Bodnar to illustrate that a history of resources is maintained and a global-context history is presented. However, Fig. 7 does not describe or suggest a history of resources accessed by the user in an order that the resources were accessed. In fact, Fig. 7 does not illustrate a history of accesses. Instead, Fig. 7 illustrates the user-specified Quick marks that have been added to the system and the date they were added by the user. Fig. 7 does not illustrate a history of resources accessed by the user and it does not illustrate a global-context history list representative of an order in which the resources were accessed. Fig. 7 merely shows the date on which the Quick marks item was entered by the user. The fact that the user entered the Quick Marks item on a particular date does not mean that the particular resource was accessed by a user of the computer application. Fig. 7 is not showing a history of access at all but instead shows a history of when items were added to the list by the user to enable quick access to their favorite sites.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 28, and its dependent claims 29-35 and 37-41.

Claims 42-46

Claims 42 and 44 recite a software application environment (claim 42) and software stored on a computer-readable medium (claim 44) that include, among other features, a navigation mechanism that enables a user of the application to move among resources based on the global-context navigation information (claim 42) and global navigation or history information, or both, based on communicated state information (claim 44).

For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 28, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 42 and 44, and their dependent claims 43, 45, and 46.

Claim 36, which depends from claim 28, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodnar. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Bodnar fails to describe or suggest the features of claim 28.

Enclosed in a check in the amount of $110 for the extension of time fee. During the pendency of this case, please apply any deficiencies or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/20/2004

Joseph F. Key
Reg. No. 44,827

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40198095.doc